## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending with this paper. Claims 1-20 are rejected by this Office Action. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, 19, and 20.

Applicant acknowledges that neither Cook et al, Zeller et al, nor the combination of Cook and Zeller, disclose the methods, apparatuses, and media claimed in claims 1-20. Applicant also acknowledges the withdrawal of objections to claims 6-9 and 15-18.

### Claim Objections

**Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities:**

**- 'claim 20' on page 5, line 1 would read well as 'claim 19'**

**- '(d)(i)' on page 5, line 3 would well as '(a)(i)'**

**- '(d)(ii)' on page 5, line 5 would read well as '(a)(ii)'**

Applicant is amending claim 20 to be properly dependent from claim 19. However, features '(d)(i)' and '(d)(ii)' of claim 20 refer to feature '(d)' of claim 19 and are labeled accordingly. Applicant requests withdrawal of the claim objections.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

**Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,701,400 (Amado) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,033 (Tatsuoka) n view of "FRA: Teaching Financial Accounting with Goal-Based Scenario" (Foster) in fuı ther view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,923 (Bogle).**

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, **determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles,** and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal." (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed. For example, the present patent application discloses (Page 9, lines 25-31. Emphasis added.):

> Specifically, a profile is a set of criteria that is matched against the domain. The purpose of a profile is to check whether the criteria defined by the profile is met in the domain. Using a visual editing tool, instructional designers create profiles to identify those things that are important to know about the domain for a given task.

-6-

> **During execution of a BusSim application at the point that feedbac]: is requested either by the student or pro-actively by the application, the se t of profiles associated with the current task are evaluated to determine wl ich ones are true.** Example profiles include: Good productions strategy but wr )ng Break-Even Formula; Good driving record and low claims history; and Cor ect Cash Flow Analysis but poor Return on Investment (ROI).

The combination of Amado, Tatsuoka, Foster, and Bogle fails to even suggest the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is t ue for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, b ised on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal." The Of ice Action alleges that (Page 4. Emphasis added.):

> ... Foster teaches (b) presenting information indicative of a goal (page 1 78, r ght column, paragraph 3), (c) integrating (page 177, left column, paragraphs  -2) information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (page 175, GO, L- BASED SCENARIOS section; page 176, left column), **(d) monitoring prog ess toward the goal and providing feedback (page 185, left column, paragra )hs 2-4) that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, wherein the feedb ick is in accordance with the profile** and (e) displaying (page 181, 'he Recommendation Report section, paragraph 1) the presentation (page 181. Fig ure 3) as the presentation executes, wherein the presentation provides a cogni ive educational experience ...

Foster does disclose (Page 185, left column, third paragraph. Emphasis added.):

> Embedding skills to be learned within some target activity is characteristic of most apprenticeship styles of learning. 'Cognitive apprenticeship' (Collins et al., 1989) adapts characteristics of traditional apprenticeship instruction to cognii ive processes. The GBS framework shares with cognitive apprenticeship an emph; sis on the practice of skills with an authentic context, with both proposals draw ng from prior work in situated cognition (Brown et al., 1989). Cognii ive apprenticeship is based on the teaching methods of: (1) modeling, or demonstration by an expert (like the expert analysis in FRA); **(2) coaching, or immediate feedback to the student**; and (3) scaffolding, or provision of to< ls, suggestions, and/or partial solutions.

Foster merely discloses "coaching, or immediate feedback to the student" and doe: not even suggest "determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task fr( m a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile." Moreover, Amado, Foster, Bogle do not remedy the deficiencies of Tatsuoka. Thus, claim l is patentable over Amado in view of Tatsuoka, Foster, and Bogle.

While the combination of Amado, Tatsuoka, Foster, and Bogle does not suggest all of the features of claim 1, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not even be motivated to combine the teachings. Claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented method for creating a presentation that provides a cognitive educational experience. However Amado is directed to "data stored in databases and diagnostics generated that are used definable interpretations of information in the database." (Amado, abstract.) Bogle is directed to "an active debugging environment for debugging a virtual application that contains program language code from multiple compiled and/or interpreted programming language ." (Bogle, abstract.) Amado and Bogle are **not** related to the field of providing a cognitive educational experience. There is a lack of motivation to combine the teachings, and thus the Office Action has not even established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Similarly, Applicant is amending claim 10 to include the feature of "logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal." Applicant is also amending claim 19 to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal." Claims 10 and 19 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, and are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-20.

-8-

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 10, 2006

Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001

-9-